



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. Box 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov
GW 52-04

GEORGE O. SAILE & ASSOCIATES
28 DAVIS AVENUE
POUGHKEEPSIE NY 12603

COPY MAILED

FEB 20 2004

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
Jung-Cheng Lin :
Application No. 09/587,465 : ON PETITION
Filed: 5 June, 2000 :
Attorney Docket No. DP-301187 :

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b),¹ filed on 18 December, 2003, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **GRANTED**.

This application became abandoned on 16 August, 2003, for failure to file a proper reply to the final Office action mailed on 15 April, 2003, which set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. A one (1) month extension of time and amendment after final rejection were filed on 20 August, 2003,

¹Effective December 1, 1997, the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) now provide that where the delay in reply was unintentional, a petition may be filed to revive an abandoned application or a lapsed patent pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b). A grantable petition filed under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by:

(1) the required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In a nonprovisional application filed on or after June 8, 1995, and abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may also be met by the filing of a request for continued examination in compliance with § 1.114. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof. In an application abandoned for failure to pay the publication fee, the required reply must include payment of the publication fee.

(2) the petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m);

(3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. The Commissioner may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional; and

(4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(c)).

but were found not to place the case in condition for allowance. The filing of the present petition precedes the mailing of Notice of Abandonment.

On 18 December, 2003, the present petition was filed, accompanied by a Request for Continued Examination (RCE). The RCE requests that the previously filed amendment be considered as the reply required under 37 CFR 1.114.

The application will be forwarded to Technology Center 2800 for consideration of the RCE and amendment.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703)308-6918.



Douglas I. Wood
Senior Petitions Attorney
Office of Petitions